



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,882	10/10/2006	Stefan Golz	2004P56028 WOUS	5299

28524 7590 01/20/2010
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

LIU, SAMUEL W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1656

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/20/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10572882	10/10/2006	GOLZ ET AL.	2004P56028 WOUS

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

SAMUEL LIU

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1656	20100108
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply filed on 11/02/09 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action mailed 10/2/09 because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicant has not adequately replied to the objections to the specification and the claims, the 112/2 rejection, the 112/1 rejection (scope enablement), the 102/103 rejection, and the 103 rejections. The reply appears merely responsive to the "Sequence compliance" requirement which alone are considered to be responsive thereof. As such, the submission filed 4/6/09 is not fully responsive because it is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.111(b), which states that "[i]n order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.

Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be bona fide, applicant is given ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

/SAMUEL LIU/
Examiner, Art Unit 1656

/ANAND U DESAI/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656